

Appl. No. 09/885,356
Supp. Amdt. Dated May 21, 2004
Reply to Examiner Interview of May 19, 2004

Remarks/Arguments

Summary of the Examiner Interview

In a telephonic interview conducted May 19, 2004, specification paragraphs [0006], [0007], [0026] and [0029] were discussed. In particular, the language relating to "term", "term weight" and "matched term weight" were discussed. The Examiner suggested making amendments to clarify differences between these terms. For example, The Examiner suggested making the non new-matter changes detailed above and adding the newly added claims. The Examiner suggested changing "terms" to "terms in the search query" and "total matched term weight" to "total matched term weight based on a sum of the term weights of the terms in the search query" to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Additionally, The Examiner suggested amending the independent method claims to include the term "computer-implemented" to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection in the previous office action. Applicant has implemented the Examiner's suggested changes in the specification and the claims, and thus reiterates Applicant's earlier arguments that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

21 MAY 2004

Date



Peter Kraguljac (Reg. No. 38,520)

(216) 363-4162